

AND STILL I RISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. And I rise today, Madam Speaker, to defend a woman's right to choose, to defend the law of the land, to defend Roe v. Wade. And I rise to do so because it is the woman's choice, not the man's.

I happen to be a male. It is not my choice. I defend a woman's right to make that choice, whatever it may be, and Roe v. Wade has to be a part of it, or the right to choose should be a part of it.

So, today, I would like to share a brief vignette to make my point. Let us assume that you are a person of means. You have resources, and you are adamantly, vehemently, totally, and absolutely opposed to abortion.

Let us assume that abortion is banned across the land, and let us assume that your daughter is raped—ban on abortion, your daughter is raped. You are vehemently, adamantly, totally, and completely opposed to abortion.

But you have the right to change your mind, and you have the right to use your resources to go to some distant place on vacation, take a road trip, and come back after you have exercised your right to choose, or your daughter has exercised her right to choose.

No woman who is raped should be forced to bear the child of the rapist. Have we no sense of what a woman goes through?

We should not allow ourselves to be put in a position where poor women without resources will not have the opportunity to exercise the right that wealthier, resourced persons will exercise.

So, I support maintaining the right to choose, and I support maintaining peaceful protest. I believe that John Kennedy was right when he proclaimed: "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable."

I don't like having people protest me as I leave the plane. I don't enjoy having people protest as I walk into supermarkets. But I accept it because I understand that this is a means by which they can express themselves without having to express themselves by more violent means.

John Kennedy is the person who said it: "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable."

Let's accept peaceful protest. I do not accept any violence in protest. But peaceful protest, as much as it may disturb me, and as much as I may dislike it, I accept it because I understand what the alternative is.

CONTEMPLATING SNAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, last month, the Agriculture Committee welcomed Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services Deputy Under Secretary Stacy Dean to a long-overdue hearing.

Until last month, the agency of the United States Department of Agriculture that occupies more than 80 percent of the Agriculture Committee's spending had gone unchecked for nearly 4 years.

Each section of title IV, the nutrition title, of the 2018 farm bill made nominal changes to a program that has since exploded to serve more than 42 million individuals, at a current cost of roughly \$9 billion per month.

Now, we need to contemplate SNAP through four principles, particularly as we shift from emergency spending and administration to more targeted and informed programming.

First, we need to further explore how to serve recipients through innovation and flexibility. If the pandemic has taught us one thing, it is there is no one way to serve families in need.

Second, we must think about the best ways to guide recipients to independence through employment, education, and training. While waivers related to work under the former administration were logical, they are now clearly keeping employable individuals idle and disengaged. It is time to talk about reemployment, with a specific focus on those who have left the labor force.

The third principle: We cannot deny program integrity has been compromised. I want to work with the Department to return to and maintain the virtues of SNAP. This includes normal modes of data collection and normal modes of analysis and dissemination of information to ensure the responsible use of program funds.

Last, and perhaps most importantly, we must come together to improve access and promote healthy foods and improved nutrition. Employment, healthcare costs, and general longevity are highly dependent on the foods that we consume. Together with modernized nutrition education initiatives, the nutrition research funding secured in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, and the existing library of research on healthy eating, USDA is uniquely positioned to improve the nutrition of millions of households, not just those deemed healthy.

I think my colleagues across the aisle can agree with each of these four principles. Where we diverge is how to preserve the program for those in actual need, without regulatory loopholes and fuzzy interpretations of the law, both of which exploit the very intent of the program. Where we diverge is the reality that this one title will cost taxpayers nearly \$1 trillion over the next 10 years.

With this exorbitant spending increase—namely, because of the less-

than-transparent and questionable Thrifty Food Plan update—the Biden administration and the current majority consciously put a colossal financial and political target on any future farm bill, compromising not only the nutrition title but the 11 other titles which support and protect every farmer, every rancher, and every forester, and rural community.

While my colleagues and I will continue to debate this attempt at executive overreach, I asked one thing of Madam Deputy Under Secretary and, frankly, the whole Department, USDA: Be more forthcoming. As the ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee, I prefer to learn directly from the administration, not from lobbyists, not from reporters, not from the internet.

More recently, the White House announced a conference on hunger, nutrition, and health in September. Now, this could change how we think about health and nutrition, including in the farm bill, but it must be nonpartisan and engage community leaders nationwide. This should be a platform for innovation, objective research, and local approaches.

That hearing should be the first of many that allows the Agriculture Committee to have an honest conversation about what is working and what is not and how we move forward toward the 2023 farm bill.

FIGHT FOR WOMEN'S
REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge that now more than ever is the time for us to come together and fight for reproductive rights for women.

Recently, through a leaked Supreme Court opinion, we learned that the progress we have made on a woman's right to choose over the last 50 years is in serious jeopardy.

The Nation learned that the almost 50-year settled law of Roe v. Wade is in danger of being undone at the hands of radical Republican Supreme Court Justices. Even worse, the Republican Party has made it clear its goal is to criminalize—I repeat, criminalize—abortions.

In short, Republicans seek to punish women and providers of abortion for women exercising their basic human rights to control their own bodies. This is terrifying.

For the first time in our history, our daughters will have less freedom than their mothers. This is unacceptable and un-American.

Republican State legislators across the Nation are already seeking to arrest doctors for offering reproductive care, and some also want to ban all abortions with zero exceptions—nada, zero.